

**From:** Tom Hafer [somethingsfishy@charter.net]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 13, 2006 4:41 PM  
**To:** MLPACComments@resources.ca.gov  
**Subject:** MLPACComments: CEQA document

The CEQA document is a regurgitation of the central core people driving this project. The conclusions in this were preconceived with no true discussion of the impacts of this project. They have one page of concerns that are not expanded upon. All of these concerns are very important for the success of this project but these people do not want to deal with them. This project is so political now, that anyone that puts any roadblock in would probably be fired.

The public came up with justifiable concerns, that need more than 1 page of recognition. The Proposed Package was picked as "environmentally superior". Now why is CEQA making that decision? Maybe if they seriously looked into the concerns of the true stakeholders they would change their minds. The Proposed Package is taking all of the best fishing reefs on the Central Coast. They are leaving us the smallest reefs and the sand. They are taking most of the fishing areas close to port, requiring fisherman to go farther in more hazardous conditions, but under hazards you say NI. They are displacing fisherman and so they are unable to spatially distribute their effort, resulting in the potential for severe impact to the small reefs left to fish, but under biological resources you say B. The socioeconomic studies in this project did not even include the recreational sport fisherman. They also did not discuss the loss of cultural heritage. These areas they are taking, like Pt. Sur, Piedras Blancas, Pt Buchon, and Purisma have been crucially important to the local fishing community for ages, going back to the Chumash Indians and the Abalone fisherman, but in your report you say under culture NI.

They also had other big gaps in information that should have been required before "OKing" this project, for instance baseline spacial abundance studies and habitat mapping that have been simply dropped as unimportant when most scientist feel it is crucial for valid research. Concerns regarding funding haven't been looked at. The long term costs are estimated for just the Central Coast to be over 13 million dollars a year. They have inadequate funds dedicated to this for the long term. Isn't that part of CEQA to insure there is proper funding for a project? Does it matter that there is an Alternative that had unanimous Stakeholder support by the fishing community, harbor depts, and by the local government that would have been easier to enforce with their support and the fact that most of the Package 1 reserves were designed near areas easy to monitor from the shoreline like JFB and Alder Creek, not like the proposed projects reserves that are very difficult to observe from the road for instance Pt Sur and Piedras Blancas. This will require the state to spend more money on unpopular "spy devices" on everyones fishing vessels.

Sure package 1 didn't take as much as the others but why do we need more? We don't even know if these are going to work? They may just be a playground for dominate species to eat up the smaller rockfish. We don't know. The presence of humans has been here for hundreds of years. Taking them out, is also an unknown impact. Tom and Sheri Hafer